



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/068,866	10/23/1998	KATSUAKIRA MORIWAKE	450108-4484	2773

20999 7590 09/22/2005

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG
745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL.
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER

CHUONG, TRUC T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2179

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/068,866

Applicant(s)

MORIWAKE ET AL.

Examiner

Truc T. Chuong

Art Unit

2179

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 July 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 149-152 and 159-163 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 149-152 and 159-163 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 October 1998 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to Amendment, filed 07/18/05.

Claims 149-152, and 159-163 are pending in this application. Claims 162-163 are independent claims. In the Amendment, claims 162-163 are amended, and claims 1-148, and 153-158 are cancelled. This action is made non-final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 149-152, and 159-163 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Klingler et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,682,326) in view of Amiot et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,781,188).

As to claim 162, Klingler teaches an editing system comprising:

A database for registering information for each of a plurality of clips (database and storage memory, e.g., col. 1 lines 60-63 and col. 2 lines 30-35);

a plurality of modules (displaying one or more movie-editing windows, e.g., col. 3 lines 13-15, col. 6 lines 1-4, figs. 3, 5, 10, and 11) for selectively performing one or more of editing, composing, and special effects processing on a plurality of clips (display all selected clips with special effects, e.g., col. 3 lines 15-30, col. 8 lines 19-30, col. 9 lines 7-24, and figs. 6 & 10) to

Art Unit: 2179

produce a first resultant clip (resultant clip, e.g., col. 3 lines 1-12), said modules being operable to perform processing on said first resultant clip to produce a second resultant clip (creating the resultant clip, col. 3 lines 9-13, and the oriental clips and the modified clips storing as digital forms which can be stored and recovered to both play back the digital movie, and recover the necessary information required to reassemble the stored media from the source media from which it was created; therefore, the modified/resultant clips can be recreated for further modification, e.g., col. 2 lines 16-21);

said plurality of clips, a composite module for performing said editing processing of said plurality of clips, a composite module for performing said special effects processing of said clips; display means for displaying a graphical user interface respectively representing said edit module, said composite module, and said special effect module on a display (figs. 4, 5, 7, 10 and 12 show the edit module (e.g., fig. 10), the composite module (e.g., figs. 4, 5, and 12), and the special effect module (e.g., fig. 10) display on the screen (the claim language only shows that modules displayed on a display NOT simultaneously displayed on the same window; therefore, Klingler still reads on the claim language));

said display means for further displaying a table of horizontally aligned rows and vertically aligned columns (fig. 4), said table including at least textual indicia identifying said plurality of clips as being material clips or resultant clips (although, Klingler clearly teaches the clips are preferably defined by a clip identifier, Tape ID, etc. (e.g., col. 6 lines 38-46, col. 7 lines 10-36, and fig. 4), Klingler does not clearly show that the IDs identifying whether the clips are material clips or resultant clips. It is well known and obvious to have the IDs with specifically defined IDs/names/codes to improve visualization to help the editors distinguish which clips are

modified or kept as original/unchanged during editing) including those clips subjected to said processing to produce said first resultant clip (One window displays some or all of selected clips of a movie-in-process, col. 3 lines 13-30, and fig. 4), and said indicia indicating the modules used to process said clips (The clips are preferably defined by a clip identifier, ID, and comments, (e.g., col. 6 lines 38-46, col. 7 lines 10-36, and fig. 4), from the comment column of fig. 4, it is well known and would have been obvious for the editor to use the comments to specify the related description/information of the process in making/editing movies including locations, methods, date, notes, and what editing system had been used to produce the modified (resultant) clips, etc. This commenting purposes will ease the editor in future of retrieving/viewing/editing), said table further identifying the second resultant clip produced as a result of processing performed on said first resultant clip (recreating the resultant clip from the “first” resultant clip or any source clips, e.g., col. 3 lines 1-12, and this feature must be shown in Klingler’ video editing system because the resultant clip or others can be stored for further editing or viewing, col. 2 lines 16-21), and indicating the type of processing performed thereon, said table further indicating duration (This information typically includes the clip name, clip duration, in and out points, the number and type of tracks comprising the clip, comments, status and tape I.D., e.g., col. 7 lines 22-36, and fig. 4) of said plurality of clips and having an enable/disable flag for each of said plurality of clips (Klingler shows the status of clips typically indicates whether the clip is a reference to source media that is still on videotape, or to media that has been digitized and stored on disk (col. 7 lines 30-36, and fig. 4) means “On disk” status is enable and “Not” is disable); however, Klinger still does not clearly show that the table having the textual indicia which is automatically generated to identify the plurality of clips. Amiot

clearly teaches the RESULT track (the resultant clip) is a combination of the original clips (the material clips), TRACK 1-5 of fig. 3 (e.g., col. 7 lines 4-18, and fig. 3). It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have the naming features among clips of Amiot in the video editing system of Klingler to ease the user in recognizing the clips during viewing, making, or editing the clips.

As to claim 163, this is a method claim of system claim 162. Note the rejection of claim 162 above.

As to claim 149, Klingler teaches the editing system according to claim 162, further comprising control means for controlling said plurality of modules based on said information registered in said database (the resultant clip or others can be stored for further editing or viewing, e.g., col. 2 lines 16-21, and col. 6 lines 38-52).

As to claim 150, Klingler teaches the editing system according to claim 149, wherein said control means updates content of a first resultant clip registered in the database, and updates content of resultant clips produced from said first resultant clip (clip can be removed from the video track and another inserted, e.g., col. 4 lines 13-15).

As to claims 151 and 152, Klingler teaches the editing system according to claim 149, wherein said control means overwrites content of a first resultant clip registered in the database with content of a new resultant clip, and updates content of resultant clips produced from said first resultant clip (Klingler inherently teaches the control of overwriting the resultant clip because the data structure and others information including source clips and the resultant clip(s) are stored in the database for both play-back and editing the digital movie/data, and recover the necessary information required to reassemble the stored media from the source media from

Art Unit: 2179

which it was created (e.g., col. 2 lines 16-21), and based on Klingler's editing system, any of the data storing in Klingler's editing system can be considered to be edited including all editing features such as replacing, renaming, deleting, modifying or reediting the above data).

As to claims 159-161, they are method claims of system claims 150-152. Note the rejections of claims 150-152 above respectively.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 149-152, and 159-163 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Truc T. Chuong whose telephone number is 571-272-4134. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and alternate Fridays 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2179

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Truc T. Chuong

09/15/05


WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2700